REMARKS

Claims 66-68 and 70-87 are pending in this application, of which Claims 66, 84, and 85 are the independent claims. Claims 66 and 84 are amended herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 101

Claims 66-68 and 70-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 101 because the claims are allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office Action suggests that independent Claims 66 and 84 be amended to add the limitation "non-transitory" to the claims. Office Action, pp.2-3. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, and in order to expedite prosecution of the subject application, Applicants have amended independent Claim 66 to recite a "non-transitory computer-readable medium or media encoded with instructions," and independent Claim 84 to recite "[a] non-transitory computer-readable medium or media encoded with instructions for facilitating management of a communications session." Applicants submit that Claims 66 and 84 as amended, and Claims 67, 68, and 70-79 which depend from Claim 66, are tied to a statutory class of subject matter. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 of Claims 66-68 and 70-84 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 85 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner asks for confirmation of the interpretation of Claim 85 as prompting the user at the remotely located computing device, and transmitting the identification information from the remotely located computing device to the computing device. Applicants respectfully submit that this interpretation is incorrect.

Claim 85 recites "prompting a user at the computing device for identification information associated with the communications session [and] transmitting, from the computing device to the remotely located computing device, the identification information." For example, if the computing device is a thin client, the remotely located computing device is a server, and the information is a username and password, then a user at the thin client would be prompted for his username and password, and the username and password would be transmitted from the thin client to the server to be used, for example, for authentication.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 85 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 66, 70, 80, 82, 84, and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,244,957 ("Walker") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,145,083 ("Shaffer"). Claims 67, 68, 72-74, 77-79, and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2005/0080915 ("Shoemaker"). Claims 71 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,854,009 ("Hughes"). Claim 75 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,876,644 ("Hsu"). Claims 83 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,089,508 ("Wright"). Claim 87 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,219,233

("Hendriks"). These rejections are respectfully traversed, and reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Each of the independent claims, namely Claims 66, 84, and 85, recites "transmitting upon an occurrence of a predetermined event, from [a] computing device to [a] remotely located computing device, a lock session signal for locking a communications session upon the occurrence of the predetermined event." It is respectfully submitted that the applied references, whether alone or in combination, in view of what was known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, do not teach or suggest at least this limitation of the independent claims.

The Office Action contends that Walker discloses this limitation of the independent claims. Applicants respectfully disagree with this contention.

Specifically, the Office Action contends that Walker's slot machine 2 corresponds to "a computing device," and the slot network server 4 corresponds to "a remotely located computing device." The Office Action uses the terms "lock session signal" and "lock start signal" interchangeably. Office Action, pp.5-7, 26. The Office Action further contends that Walker teaches that the slot network server 4 transmits the "lock start signal" to lock the slot machine 2 so that an automated play session requested by a game player may begin at a specified lock start time. Office Action, p.26. Similarly, the Office Action provides an example wherein a "network server 4 sends a lock session signal to the slot machine 2; so that the automated play session may begin at 5:00 P.M." *Id.*

Assuming, *arguendo*, that the foregoing is true, Walker nowhere teaches or suggests that the lock session signal/lock start signal is sent *from* the slot machine 2 *to* the slot network server 4, but instead, as contended above by the Office Action, teaches that the lock session signal/lock

start signal is sent from the slot network server 4 to the slot machine 2. In this regard, Walker discloses that "[c]ommencement of automated play includes the slot network server 4 transmitting locking data to the slot machine 2. The locking data is a signal that prevents the slot machine 2 from accepting coins and entering manual mode unless automated play is terminated by the player that initiated it." Walker, col.9 ll.1-6. Applicants, on the other hand, claim the *opposite*. Specifically, with reference to particular claim language, Applicants claim "transmitting upon an occurrence of a predetermined event, from [a] computing device [i.e., the Office Action's contended slot machine 2] to [a] remotely located computing device [i.e., the Office Action's contended slot network server], a lock session signal for locking a communications session upon the occurrence of the predetermined event."

As for Shaffer, the other reference applied against the independent claims, it discloses a security module 58 that "may include a timing mechanism that monitors manipulation of the user input devices 44 to detect periods of inactivity" and a screen saver 56 that "switches the computing device 12 to a locked mode when the computing device is idle for a period exceeding the preselected period." Shaffer, col.5, ll.18-25 and FIG. 2. As shown in Shaffer's FIG. 2, all of the devices (i.e., the security module 58, the user input device 44 and the screen saver 56) used to detect inactivity and switch the computing device 12 to a locked mode are located in the computing device 12. Even if inactivity is detected, no lock session signal is transmitted from the computing device 12 to a server 38, let alone "transmitting upon an occurrence of a predetermined event, from [a] computing device to [a] remotely located computing device, a lock session signal for locking a communications session upon the occurrence of the predetermined event," as recited in each of the independent claims. None of the other references is understood to remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Walker or Shaffer.

Accordingly, the applied references, either alone or in combination, in view of what was known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, are not understood to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of the independent claims, which are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the independent claims are respectfully requested.

The other claims currently under consideration in the application are dependent from the independent claims discussed above and therefore are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least similar reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the dependent claims are respectfully requested.

The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be other reasons for patentability of any or all claims that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede, or an actual concession of, any issue with regard to any claim, or any cited art, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any questions, please call the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502203 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

/Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub/
Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub, Reg. # 39,266

18191 Von Karman Ave., Suite 500
Irvine, CA 92612-7108
Phone: 949.851.0633 AAS:kcc
Facsimile: 949.851.9348
Date: October 27, 2010

Please recognize our Customer No. 31824 as our correspondence address.